



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/803,814	02/24/97	SIITONEN	L 466-006903-U

HARRY F SMITH
PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD CT 06430

LM41/0423

EXAMINER

JUNG, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2771

#8

DATE MAILED:

04/23/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/803,814

Applicant(s)
Siitonen et al.

Examiner
David Jung

Group Art Unit
2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 25, 1998

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2771

DETAILED ACTION

Resetting of Finality

1. The previous Office Action did not specifically mention claims 12-28. Thus, the finality of the previous Office Action is withdrawn and this Office Action is put in its stead. The date of the finality of this application is to be reset as the mailing date of this Office Action.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment argues, especially at page 14, that multiple directories are novel. Yet, the Manual for EC-359 (previously cited by Applicant) teaches such a multiple directory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdul-Halim and Hashimoto et al. and Owner's Manual EC-359 (heretofore referred as "Manual"- the Manual

Art Unit: 2771

having been cited by Applicant on April 21, 1998). Claims 1, 3, 6, 25, 28 are the independent claims; claims 2, 4-5, 7-11, 12-27 are the dependent claims.

In regard to claim 1, Abdul-Halim teaches a “a method for operating a personal digital assistant ..., storing ... relatable call numbers, choosing from a directory ...” as in claim 1. See Abstract which discusses pager (a type of a personal digital assistant) with directory entries.

Abdul-Halim does not teach “inputting a search key ..., comparing the search key ..., selecting a record ..., and utilizing the information ... to initiate ... electronic communication” as in claim 1.

Hashimoto et al. teaches “inputting a search key ..., comparing the search key ..., selecting a record ..., and utilizing the information ... to initiate ... electronic communication” as in claim 1. See Abstract which discusses a paging device with a search. See also column 1, lines 63 to column 2, lines 16, which discusses an electronic organizer (which is another type of a personal digital assistant).

Manual teaches such an electronic organizer. Manual teaches such multiple directory as in claim 1. See pages 26-27. Note how the search by company or by name lends itself to multiple directories (by company or by name).

Hashimoto suggest to combine with an electronic organizer such as Manual for the purpose of utilizing the information. See column 1, lines 63 to column 2, lines 16. Thus, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Manual and Hashimoto et al. for the purpose of utilizing the information.

Art Unit: 2771

Hashimoto et al. suggests to combine with a pager such as Abdul-Halim. - with the suggested purpose of having a pager to received from the paging device, thereby obtaining the benefit of user convenience. Such having both pager and receiver on a single device is convenient to the user. This benefit is commonly recognized in the communication arts. To wit, the common telephone has both a speaker end that is held to the ear and a speaking end that is held to the mouth of the user. That such a combination be of a single device that has both the pager and paging device is discussed at column 1, lines 10-32 of Hashimoto et al.

Thus, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Abdul-Halim and Hashimoto et al. for the benefit of user convenience.

In regard to claim 3, such search is discussed in Hashimoto et al. See Abstract which discusses sequential search.

In regard to claim 6, such display is discussed in Abdul-Halimn. See Abstract.

In regard to claim 25, such search is discussed in Hashimoto et al. See Abstract which discusses sequential search.

In regard to claim 2, such sequential search is suggested in Hashimoto et al. See Abstract which discusses sequential search.

In regard to claim 4, such routing of message is suggested in Hashimoto et al. See column 4, lines 18-37, which discusses messages being sent.

Art Unit: 2771

In regard to claim 5, such sending a message at various times is suggested in Hashimoto et al. See column 4, lines 18-37, which discusses messages being sent at various times such as fixed messages and conditional messages.

In regard to claim 7, such QWERTY keyboard is well known in the art for the purpose of using established input means.

In regard to claim 8, such telephone keypad is well known in the art for the purpose of using established input means.

In regard to claim 9, such touch screen is well known in the art for the purpose of using established input means.

In regard to claim 10, such voice recognition is well known in the art for the purpose of using established input means.

In regard to claim 11, such email and internet hookup is well known in the art for the purpose of facilitating communication.

In regard to the various recitations of features of claims 12-24, 26-28, such features are taught by the passages cited in the rejections of claims 1-11, 25. For the reasons noted in the rejections of claims 1-11, 25, claims 12-24, 26-28 are not patentable.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2771

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

6. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Application/Control Number: 08/803,814

Page 7

Art Unit: 2771

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2771

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (703) 308-5262 or Thomas Black whose telephone number is (703) 305-9707.



THOMAS G. BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

DJ

April 5, 1999